APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/736,328	12/12/2003	David R. Cook	NVID-P000734	3697

7590   12/14/2006

WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP
Third Floor
Two North Market Street
San Jose, CA 95113

EXAMINER
RAMPURIA, SATISH

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
2191	

DATE MAILED: 12/14/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

DETAILED ACTION

1.   This action is in response to the application filed on December 12, 2003.

2.   Claims 1-31 are pending.

Oath/Declaration

3.   The Office acknowledges receipt of a properly signed oath/declaration filed

December 12, 2003.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

4.   35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

5.   Claims 12-22 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed

invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter.

Claim 12 is non-statutory because the language of the claim raises a

question as to whether the claim is directed merely to an abstract idea which would

result in a practical application producing a concrete, useful, and tangible result to

form the basis of statutory subject matter under 35 U.S.C. 101. Claim recites a

system for specifying setting used with a file, representing functional descriptive

material without a computer readable storage medium or a memory, software

application (program code) per se are not tangibly embodied. Claims 13-22 are

directly or indirectly dependent on claim 12 and further support a system for

specifying setting used with a file, representing functional descriptive material without a computer readable storage medium or a memory, software application (program code) per se are not tangibly embodied thus amounts to only abstract idea and are nonstatutory.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

6.   Claim 1, 12, and 23 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Regarding, claim 1, the limitation, "other files associated" is unclear as to what other files are associated.

Regarding, claim 12, the limitation, "other files associated" is unclear as to what other files are associated.

Regarding, claim 23, the limitation, "other files associated" is unclear as to what other files are associated.

Clarification and/or correction are required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

7.   The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --
  (e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States

only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

8.   Claims 1-9, 12-20, and 23-29 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being

anticipated by US Patent No. 6,892,231 to Jager (hereinafter, Jager).

Per claim 1:

Jager discloses:

-   A method of specifying settings used with a file, said method comprising:

-   accessing said file using a software application (col. 2, lines 45-50 "verify a <u>global</u>

    configuration file"), wherein associated with said application are global settings

    applied to said file (col. 2, lines 45-61 "...a <u>global</u> configuration file... the rules in

    a first block of the configuration file are identified"), said application automatically

    imposing said global settings on all files associated with said application by

    default (col. 2, lines 45-61 "...A <u>settings file</u> is then created with the identified

    rules set as "true." The configuration process is then performed using the <u>global</u>

    configuration <u>file and the settings file...</u>");

-   saving a file-specific setting defined for said file (col. 15, lines 50-55 "saving said

    flattened settings in a data file"), said file-specific setting replacing a

    corresponding global setting defined by said application for said file (col. 2, lines

    50-55 "an error message is generated if related <u>settings</u> are set

    inconsistently...process is then repeated for each block in the <u>global</u>

    configuration file... <u>settings file</u> is created corresponding to each block"), wherein

    said global settings for other files associated with said application are unchanged

by said file-specific setting (col. 3, lines 20-33 "changes in the flattened

configuration files caused by changes in the global configuration file can be

identified"); and

-   upon subsequent accessing of said file, using said file-specific setting

    instead of said corresponding global setting (col. 3, lines 33-49 "the flattened files

    may be used to simplify the server computer configuration process").

Per claim 2:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager discloses:

-   accessing said file (col. 2, lines 45-50 "verify a <u>global</u> configuration file"); and

    overriding said corresponding global setting with said file-specific setting (see

    FIG. 4 and related discussion).

Per claim 3:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager discloses:

-   saving said file-specific setting with the content of said file (col. 3, lines 20-49

    "saves a set of flattened configuration files for a first global configuration file").

Per claim 4:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager discloses:

- associating said file-specific setting with said file (col. 3, lines 20-33 "changes in the flattened configuration files caused by changes in the global configuration file can be identified"); and

- saving said file-specific setting separate from the content of said file (col. 3, lines 20-49 "saves a set of flattened configuration files for a first global configuration file").

Per claim 5:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager discloses:

- wherein said file-specific setting is saved in a registry, wherein said registry comprises a hierarchical arrangement of application-specific global settings and file-specific settings (col. 8, lines 22-33 "...these configuration settings are determined based upon information provided with the request, or from information maintained in a registry of the Web server computer").

Per claim 6:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager discloses:

- wherein said file-specific setting is associated with the file name of said file, and wherein said file-specific setting is indexed using said file name (col. 3, lines 20-33 "changes in the flattened configuration files caused by changes in the global configuration file can be identified").

Per claim 7:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager discloses:

- wherein said file is associated with a Web page and said file name comprises a

  Uniform Resource Locator (col. 8, lines 20-33 "...Configuration <u>settings</u> may

  include HTTP_HOST, HOST_NAME, HOST_IP, and USER_USTORE

  configuration <u>settings</u> 98A-98N and their associated values").

Per claim 8:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager discloses:

- wherein said file-specific setting is derived from the content of said file (col. 3,

  lines 20-33 "changes in the flattened configuration files caused by changes in the

  global configuration file can be identified").

Per claim 9:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager discloses:

- wherein the file name of said file comprises a string of characters that invoke said

  file-specific setting (col. 7, lines 22-40 "...Each block is identified by a unique

  name and may include an associated rule").

Claims 12-20 are the system claim corresponding to method claims 1-9,

respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the

rejection of claims 1-9, respectively, above.

Claims 23-29 are the similar claims to method claims 1-9, respectively, and

rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims

1-9, respectively, above.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

9.   The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all

obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in
section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art
are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a
person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be
negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.

10.   Claims 10-11, 21-22, and 30-31 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as

being unpatentable over Jager in view of US Patent No. 6,825,860 to Hu et al.,

(hereinafter, Hu).

Per claims 10:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager does not explicitly

disclose wherein said file-specific setting comprises display window size and position

with respect to said application.

However, Hu discloses in an analogous computer system wherein said file-specific setting comprises display window size and position with respect to said application (col. 2, lines 24-41 "...The scaling in the vertical direction then proportionately changes the size of the elements depicted in the representation. Resizing in the horizontal direction then allows for selection of discrete subsections or units of the physical system depicted in the image....").

Therefore, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made to incorporate the method of wherein said file-specific setting comprises display window size and position with respect to said application as taught by Hu into the method of generating file (flattened) specific settings as taught by Jager. The modification would be obvious because of one of ordinary skill in the art would be motivated to have file specific settings with window size and position to provide an improved windowing and scaling technique as suggested by Hu (col. 2, lines 5-10).

Per claims 11:

The rejection of claim 1 is incorporated and further, Jager does not explicitly disclose wherein said file comprises multiple pages for display by said application, wherein said file-specific setting comprises identification of a page last displayed when said file was closed.

However, Hu discloses in an analogous computer system wherein said file comprises multiple pages for display by said application, wherein said file-specific

setting comprises identification of a page last displayed when said file was closed (col. 2, lines 15-24 "...A user may desire viewing of one or more of the groups as discrete units to maintain visibility of specific details. The groups are then defined for presentation in the representations, and the group associations are maintained in the depiction displayed within a viewing window...").

The feature of wherein said file comprises multiple pages for display by said application, wherein said file-specific setting comprises identification of a page last displayed when said file was closed would be obvious for the reasons set forth in the rejection of claim 10.

Claims 21-22 are the system claim corresponding to method claims 10-11, respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 10-11, respectively, above.

Claims 30-31 are the similar claims to the method claims 10-11, respectively, and rejected under the same rational set forth in connection with the rejection of claims 10-11, respectively, above.

Conclusion

11.   The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to **Satish S. Rampuria** whose telephone number is **(571) 272-3732**. The examiner can normally be reached on **8:30 am to 5:00 pm** Monday to Friday except every other Friday and federal holidays. Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the **TC 2100 Group receptionist: 571-272-2100.**

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, **Wei Y. Zhen** can be reached on **(571) 272-3708**. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is **571-273-8300**.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Satish S. Rampuria
Patent Examiner/Software Engineer
Art Unit 2191

10/736,328

Satish S. Rampuria

WEI ZHEN

SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER